

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application, and Claims 10 – 13 were previously cancelled.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 were rejected.

In this Amendment, Claims 1, 5, 9, 14, 18, and 19 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of this Amendment.

Accordingly, Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 remain at issue.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-13 and 19-20

Claims 1-13 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Boltz, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,081,731 in view of *Corrigan, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,097). Although Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, independent Claims 1, 5, 9, and 14 - 19 are amended to clarify the invention and remove any ambiguities that may have been the basis for this claim rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to an information processing system.

In relevant part, Claim 1 recites:

“...a first information processing apparatus;
a plurality of second information processing apparatuses, each installed in one of a plurality of areas and configured for authenticating the first information processing apparatus located in one of the plurality of areas which corresponds to the area of the authenticating second information processing apparatus; and
a third information processing apparatus for providing content to the first information processing apparatus, the third information processing apparatus located in an another area distinct from the plurality of areas,
....
the first information processing apparatus sends authentication information for authenticating a user, the authentication information is based on authentication screen information received from the third information processing apparatus, and information about the location area of first information processing apparatus to the third information processing apparatus via the network...”

That is, the third information processing apparatus selects one of the plurality of second information processing apparatuses based on the area information that the first and second information processing apparatuses are located in the same area. Moreover, the third information processing apparatus is located in an area distinct from the plurality of areas.

This is clearly unlike *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other. The Examiner states that in *Boltz* the Base Station (third information processing apparatus) 24 selects the Mobile Switching Center (MSC)/Visitor Location Register (VLR) areas (second information processing apparatus) 12. However, *Boltz* states, in column 2, lines 45 – 62, that (emphasis added):

“With reference to FIG. 1 of the drawings, there is illustrated a Public Land Mobile Network (PLMN), such as cellular network 10, which in turn is composed of a plurality of areas 12, each with a Mobile Switching Center (MSC) 14 and an integrated Visitor Location Register (VLR) 16 therein. The MSC/VLR areas 12, in turn, include a plurality of Location Areas (LA) 18, which is defined as that part of a given MSC/VLR area 12 in which a mobile station (MS) 20 may move freely without having to send update location information to the MSC/VLR area 12 that controls that LA 18. *Each Location Area 12 is divided into a number of cells 22.* Mobile Station 20 is the physical equipment, e.g., a car phone or other portable phone, used by mobile subscribers to communicate with the cellular network 10. *A Base Station (BS) 24 is the physical equipment, illustrated for simplicity as a radio tower, that provides radio coverage to the geographical area of the cell 22 in which to handle radio traffic to and from the MS 20.*”

That is, in *Boltz* the third information processing apparatus (BS 24), in communication with a second information processing apparatus (MSC/VLR 12), shares the same area as that of the first information processing apparatus (Mobile Station 20), in contrast to the claimed limitation of Claim 1 which requires that BS 24 be located in an another area distinct from that of Mobile Station 20 and MSC/VLR 12. Further, *Corrigan* also fails to fairly teach or suggest this distinguishable limitation of Claim 1.

As such, Claim 1 is patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are dependent Claims 1 – 4, for at least the same reasons.

Independent Claims 5, 9, 14, 18 and 19, which also recite the same distinguishable limitation at that of Claim 1, are also patentable over *Boltz* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their corresponding dependent Claims for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103 Obviousness Rejection of Claims 14-18

Claims 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Higuchi et al. ("*Higuchi*") (U.S. Publication No. 2003-0050050) in view of *Corrigan*. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 14 and 18 recite the same distinguishable limitation as that of Claim 1, discussed above.

As stated above, *Corrigan* fails to teach or suggest that a plurality of second information processing apparatuses, each installed in one of a plurality of areas and configured for authenticating the first information processing apparatus located in one of the plurality of areas which corresponds to the area of the authenticating second information processing apparatus, and a third information processing apparatus for providing content to the first information processing apparatus, the third information processing apparatus located in an another area distinct from the plurality of areas, as required by Claim 1. Moreover, in addition to *Corrigan*, *Higuchi* also fails to teach or suggest this distinguishable limitation.

As such, Claims 14 and 18 are patentable over *Higuchi* and *Corrigan*, taken singly or in combination with each other, as are their corresponding dependent claims, if any, for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that these claim rejections be withdrawn.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that Claims 1 – 9 and 14 – 20 are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Dated: Oct 13, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By: David R. Metzger
David R. Metzger
Registration No. 32,919
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000